

Stakeholders Committee Meeting

State Resource Strategy Meeting

February 8, 2010

Idaho Panhandle National Forests Supervisor's Office

Coeur d'Alene, Idaho

Meeting begin about 1:00 am

Stakeholders Committee Members attending in Coeur d'Alene

- Steve Kimball, Idaho Department of Lands
- Dave Stephenson, Idaho Department of Lands
- Ed Warner, Idaho Department of Lands – Forest Legacy Program
- Serena Carlson, Intermountain Forest Association
- Kurt Mettler, Coeur d'Alene Tribe
- Thomas Herron, IDEQ
- Mary Fritz, Idaho Department of Lands
- Carol Randle, USFS
- Don Gunter, Boundary County Fire Safe program.
- Ron Kolzen, Shoshone County

Core Team/ Stakeholders Committee Members attending remotely:

- Cindi Lane, Forest Service: Clearwater, Nez Perce/ Payette National Forests (Kamiah)
- Jeff Handle, Idaho Parks and Recreation
- Dana Coelho, Western Forestry Coalition
- Paul Garcias, University of Idaho

Committee Staff Attendees:

- Jill Cobb, USDA Forest Service-IPNF and IDL, Note Taker

Welcome/Introductions/Agenda

Steve welcomed everyone and reviewed the agenda. The goal of the meeting is to discuss the core team's work on the Resource Strategy. We'd like to have an open discussion about the process and progress of this effort. The group does not want to get too far ahead in the process without securing Stakeholder support of the process. Steve encouraged the Stakeholders to provide feedback on our efforts to date and he solicited ideas from the group regarding the competitive grant process.

Dave briefed the stakeholders on the status of both the Assessment and the Strategy. He reminded them that there are two parts to this larger effort. For the Assessment, we relied heavily upon the geospatial analysis and determined where trends occur across the landscape.

From the Assessment, the next step is to develop a long-term comprehensive strategy on a landscape scale. Dave further explained that the Farm Bill requires each State to complete an

Assessment and Strategy. Using the Strategy, our state competes for funding from Forest Service State & Private Forestry programs. The Strategy enables our state to compete for money and foster coordination with multiple groups and individuals. In completing the Assessment, we reviewed seven key issues that both threaten and provide benefits to and from forests. Using geospatial tools, we derived the map showing the Assessment of Forest Resources.

Currently, we are in the process of developing the Strategy. Using the Assessment, we defined statewide goals and strategies followed by goals and strategies specific to key landscapes, also referred to as "Priority Areas." As we refine the goals and strategies specific to the Priority Areas, we are gathering information from local contacts and organizations familiar with those unique areas.

Steve asked the Stakeholders to focus on the process that we have used thus far.

1. Developing statewide goals and strategies.
2. Identifying priority areas
3. Developing goals and strategies for each priority area for the next five years.

Dave asked the group for supplemental information to develop five year strategic plan. We have about 14 priority areas. Dave briefly reviewed the priority areas and highlighted key issues. He shared with the group, that we will be hosting video conferences around the state. He highlighted our accomplishments to date and the schedule of future meetings. Dave reminded the Stakeholders that all of our most current information is available on the website.

The Core Team participated in three strategy meetings thus far and has developed the Statewide Goals and Strategies based on the eight core issues. The team is trying to complement existing plans to build on earlier efforts. Eventually, we will need to identify where existing plans might be in conflict with one another.

Steve summarized the work to date as well as the next steps planned. We have the priority areas identified and will focus on goals and strategies for the remaining priority areas over February and March. The Core Team has a good start on the Statewide Goals and Strategies and we are continuing to refine them. The effort thus far has been very thorough and over the next few weeks the Core Team will narrow down potential projects.

Steve opened up the floor for comments and from the Stakeholders and/or Core Team Members.

- Serena says her comfort level is good but the timber industry folks initial reaction is that they don't understand why the Strategy is needed and they hope it is not prescriptive. The Team feels that some of the concerns will be dispelled when the final product is ready. This adds extra emphasis to the need developing well thought out roll out of the communication strategy.
- Ed Warner asked if it would be possible to get a peer review of the process and the product. Not sure who the peer group would be...could we talk and think about it? Could we have our neighboring states review our efforts? Dave asked Dana about how process is going in other states. Dana responded that the national CORE team is supposed to be constantly providing peer review, supports other state review. She said Idaho's process is one of the furthest along.
- Carol Randall liked the talking points but noticed no mention of forest health in the Coeur d'Alene Basin portion of the strategy. She suggested that the Team reconsider that

omission because of the efforts by the County Commissioners to secure a COGEN plant would be strengthened if we were to emphasize the forest health issue.

- Paul Garcias asked if we could explore various scenarios to help us give empirical idea of consequences of our actions. He suggests showing the benefits of completing the strategies that we have suggested. In the geography dept, there are the modeling capabilities. Steve asked Paul to send follow up email to look at modeling options.
- Kurt commented that the Core Team should not spend time looking at all the plans listed during the development of the goals and strategies. There is agreement from many that we have far too many plans to review efficiently. The focus should be to extract those select actions from each plan that would be accomplished in the next five years. It was suggested that each stakeholder could review their plans and list for the core team those key actions that would occur in the next five years.
- Carol added that we need to add Idaho Dept of Agriculture as a collaborator.
- Cindi Lane shared that the people she interviewed are concerned that those areas that they consider important are not showing up as important under our assessments. Steve said it would be very helpful for the local folks to identify those unique areas. Furthermore, these local people should be encouraged to identify those items that our assessment missed. Cindi shared the example of the Hwy 12 corridor. The Assessment does not highlight that area as important, but the local commissioners think of it as a very high priority area.
- Cindi also shared that the folks she interviewed did not think that the Core Team was looking closely enough at ecological risks.
- Cindi emphasized sense of place by the local citizens.
- Steve said we need to continue to encourage wide range of collaborators to be involved. Between now and June, we will get some work done but more refined work will be done by the locals after June as they pull together collaborative groups and efforts.
- Ron (Shoshone County) said that he was concerned with the end product, not necessarily the process of getting there. In Shoshone County, the locals feel like they have little control on federal and state lands. He shared the concern that in this process, we need to continue to solicit local information and identify high priority on the ground needs.
- Steve summarized the concerns by stating that we will continue to support local collaborative efforts to achieve statewide goals. The Core team does not want people to not worry about the map, but rather we need locals to help us identify the highest priority strategies. We need to highlight existing strategies and collaborations, rather than creating something completely new.
- Mary Fritz asked if we planned to look for commonalities between the groups. Steve responded that as part of this effort, we will look for commonalities.
- Ron said that it seems to him that the Core Team lacks a State purpose. Steve responded that it is evolving and that this document may help congeal energy at the state level to address important issues.
- Jeff Handel suggested that we share with Stakeholders what the State will get from this process. In the Assessment, we should provide examples of how the funding will actually be beneficial to local communities and existing collaborators. Steve said we'll address in the Strategy how this effort will be used and be beneficial.
- The group was asked if they were aware of any overlooked Stakeholders? Carol suggested presenting the Idaho Association of Counties.
- Mary asked about the communication strategy. Steve said we will get to a draft document prior to creating a communication strategy. Steve and Dave have talked to the Governor and the various Forests, Advisory Groups, County Commissioners and

other interest groups. The short power point that Dave showed will be put on the website to convey information. In March, as we develop the draft document we'll check in with the Stakeholders to make sure that the effort is not missing key strategies.

- Cindi said from her surveying effort, it appears that it is split between who knew of the Assessment and who didn't. Many folks are asking for an executive summary (key points, concise documents). In response to this request, Dave will post a four page IDL briefing paper on the website before the end of the week. Another idea submitted by Steve is to consider creating and circulating a video about the effort. The group of Stakeholders felt that most people wanted the one-on-one touch and personal sharing of the effort. Given that we have limited staff and time, we will have to prioritize groups to visit. Another means of sharing information is to send out a letter to link people to material on the website.
- Cindi asked about modeling consequences and if we could incorporate that into our Assessment. Steve said that could be one of our strategies.
- Steve reminded the group to flag out most important things to do in the next five years. We might consider prioritizing projects by theme to maximize funding options for collaborative efforts.

Competitive Grant Opportunities.

Mary said grant applications are due by end of September. Idaho competes with 17 other western states. The focus of the grants is to protect, enhance and preserve forest resources. We need to tie this to our strategy and assessment as well. The State needs to look at collective efforts where we can team up agencies, organizations to get meaningful projects on the ground. Process for this year, pre proposal/Request for Proposals with target date of May 1st and submissions back by June 1st. The RFP criteria includes the following:

1. Collaboration of grants. (e.g. Existing collaborative groups)
2. Program Integration
3. Leverage Resources
4. Scale of the project, (How well can the project produce meaningful results?)
5. Sphere of influence
6. Sustainability beyond life of project

Groups may apply for up to \$300,000, for five projects with a one to three year life for projects. After the pre proposal, the State would work with selected groups in June and help them finalize a cohesive and competitive grant application. Dave will work with Dana to give a list of past successful competitive grants. Dana encouraged tight coordination between Strategies and competitive grants. As we are looking across the state for the Resource Strategy, it is timely to think about how they connect to competitive grant process.

Steve reminded Core Team Members of the scheduled meetings coming up on February 18th and 19th at the Fernan Ranger Station.

Notes Recorded by Jill Cobb and edited by Steve Kimball.